



CIP #32.0107

# Comprehensive Guidance Program Performance Review: Connecting Program Improvement and Student Learning

**Draft August 2003**

**School:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**District:** \_\_\_\_\_

On-Site Review Form for Program Approval \_\_\_\_\_  
or Annual Self-Evaluation \_\_\_\_\_

# CGP Performance Review: Connecting Program Improvement and Student Learning

## Section I:      System Support

Standard I	Board Adoption and Approval
Standard II	Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Training
Standard III	Structural Components
Standard IV	Time Allocation
Standard V	Interschool Communication
Standard VI	Program Leadership and Management
Standard VII	Needs Assessment and Needs Data

## Section II:      Direct Services

Standard VIII	Responsive Services
Standard IX	Guidance Curriculum
Standard X	Career Exploration and Development
Standard XI	SEOP Process
Standard XII	Every Student

# Review Protocol

## On-Site Review Process

This on-site review is a process implemented in the Utah Comprehensive Guidance Program to ensure that the program elements described in the review standards are being implemented. Historically, we have referred to this on-site review process as an “evaluation” which provides program “accountability.” It may be helpful to provide some definitions and common language to use in the on-site review process:

*accountability:* We can discuss accountability in terms of meeting program standards or using funds appropriately. However, in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries accountability as used by the general public means student achievement.

*evaluation:* “The purpose of evaluation is . . . to improve. . . .In educational evaluation, all available types of data, qualitative as well as quantitative, may be brought to bear” *Evaluating Guidance Programs: A Practitioner’s Guide*, 1991, ACT, p. 11). Other than the needs assessment, the CGP has not emphasized the use of data to define program goals or measure program success in meeting these goals. Effective school improvement, as well as the Northwest Accreditation process, requires an increase in the use of data as it relates to CGP.

*on-site review:* A peer-to-peer review of the standards/elements of a Comprehensive Guidance Program.

*program audit:* “A program audit is used to determine that a guidance program exists. A program cannot be evaluated until certain criteria are met” (Ibid, p. 16). A standard in this document rated at level 3 overall has met the audit requirements.

The on-site review process, as we have known it, provides an audit of the Comprehensive Guidance Program - it has been used to ensure that a program is in place. An evaluation of the Comprehensive Guidance Program requires looking at the results, specifically improved performance for students. This document can help members of a guidance team begin making connections between Comprehensive Guidance Program elements or standards and desired results for students as required by the Northwest Accreditation process described in the National Study of School Improvement (NSSE) document *School Improvement: Focusing on Student Performance*.

The on-site review process works like an SEOP conference for the Comprehensive Guidance Program in that it serves to :

- Celebrate the school Comprehensive Guidance Program.
- Recognize program strengths and accomplishments.
- Identify goals and areas for improvement.

## Essential elements for the on-site review process:

In order to be prepared for a successful Performance Evaluation a school program must have prepared three items:

1. A completed self-evaluation of the CGP with copies of the self-evaluation for every member of the review team.
2. A program manual–See the description that follows.
3. Documentation that the program as described in the manual is being implemented.

## Program Manual

In the past most schools have provided a large binder which included program descriptions and substantial evidence supporting the program. Now, following the format of this document, the program being reviewed provides a program manual that contains a brief written response to each of the twelve standards, with a declaration of the level of self evaluation for each indicator followed by specific details that support that self-evaluation. Programs must then also provide an organized file of evidence to support the written description and self- evaluation ratings.

### General format for the on-site review process

1. Generally, one Comprehensive Guidance Program will be reviewed by one team in one day. Exceptions to this guideline may be obtained by submitting a written request to the state Comprehensive Guidance specialist.
2. At least one month prior to the on-site review, the Comprehensive Guidance team completes a copy of this form as a self-evaluation and submits the completed form to the district counseling leader. Completing a self-evaluation allows for honest reflection on the Comprehensive Guidance Program and provides genuine opportunities for program improvement. The guidance team under review should circle the box for each indicator as they believe it applies to their program.
3. The Comprehensive Guidance team during the review then presents evidence to support the levels of performance on the self-evaluation for each standard. The review team can then check the indicator boxes as the team makes their presentation. This should result in a side-by-side comparison of the self-evaluation and the review team evaluation.
4. The following time frame is recommended for the actual on-site review:
  - One to 1 ½ hours for the guidance team to make their presentation. Plan your time for each standard accordingly. Please make student, parent, and teacher involvement brief. The review team leader should keep team questions brief and the discussion focused.
  - One-half to 1 hour for members of the review team to discuss their findings and prepare a summary and feedback for the program being evaluated.
  - One-half to 1 hour to discuss the evaluation with the Comprehensive Guidance Program team members, allowing adequate time for response and feedback from the team members of the program being reviewed.
5. District guidance leaders overseeing the on-site review will acquire signatures from team members and district leadership.
6. District guidance leaders submit a finalized copy of the review to the state specialist by **May 1** of the current school year.

### On-Site Review Team

1. A site review **team leader** is identified to facilitate the review process. This **team leader** should have participated on 3 or 4 review teams and should have prepared for a school's on-site review more than once.
2. Generally, team members include a District ATE Director and/or a District Counseling Director, 2 or 3 school counselors, and a building administrator.
3. The majority of review team members should be from schools at the same level as the program being reviewed; e.g., middle school/JHS counselors review middle school/JHS programs, and high school counselors review high school programs. Likewise, alternative programs should be reviewed by at least one other alternative school counselor.
4. Elementary counselors or administrators can participate as evaluators only if they have recent experience at the secondary level and have a good understanding of secondary

Comprehensive Guidance Programs. However, elementary personnel and others can be observers.

5. Team members should recognize that the on-site review is a formal process requiring professional etiquette; e.g., cell phones off and schedules arranged to give full attention to the guidance team presentation and the review process.

## Related Policies and Guidelines

### **53A-1a-106. School district and individual school powers.**

(2) (b) (i) Each local school board, in consultation with school personnel, parents, and school community councils or similar entities, shall establish policies to provide for the effective implementation of a personalized student education plan (SEP) or student education/occupation plan (SEOP) for each student at the school site.

(ii) The policies shall include guidelines and expectations for:

(A) recognizing the student's accomplishments, strengths, and progress towards meeting student achievement standards as defined in U-PASS;

(B) planning, monitoring, and managing education and career development; and

(C) involving students, parents, and school personnel in preparing and implementing SEPs and SEOPs.

(iii) A parent may request conferences with school personnel in addition to SEP or SEOP conferences established by local school board policy.

(iv) Time spent during the school day to implement SEPs and SEOPs is considered part of the school term referred to in Subsection **53A-17a-103(5)**.

### **R277-462-3**

A. (3) In order to qualify for Comprehensive Guidance Program funds, schools shall implement SEOP policies and practices, consistent with Section 53A-1a-106(2) (b), local board policy, and the school improvement plan developed for Northwest Accreditation. Successful on-site reviews of the Comprehensive Guidance Program shall indicate a balance of activities in individual student planning, guidance curriculum, responsive services and system support.

<b>The Utah Model for Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance provides the following TARGET Time Distribution, pages 7 and 17. (Includes equivalent days in a 180-day school year.)</b>			
	<b>Percentages</b>		
	Elementary School	Middle/Junior High	High School
Responsive Services	<b>35</b> (= 63 days)	<b>25</b> (= 45 days)	<b>25</b> (= 45 days)
Guidance Curriculum	<b>40</b> (= 72 days)	<b>35</b> (= 63 days)	<b>25</b> (= 45 days)
Individual Planning	<b>10</b> (= 18 days)	<b>25</b> (= 45 days)	<b>25 - 35</b> (= 45-63 days)
System Support	<b>15</b> (= 27 days)	<b>15</b> (= 27 days)	<b>15</b> (= 27 days)

### **Important:**

*Team leaders, please read the following interpretations of the Level of Performance ratings aloud to the members of the on-site review team and the Comprehensive Guidance Program team prior to beginning the program review:*

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| Level 4 | An overall 4 rating on a standard indicates an exemplary CG Program with data supporting contributions to school improvement, student achievement and connections to the overall mission of the school. Standards rated at this level have a close connection to the NSSE School Improvement Plan and the Northwest Accreditation process described in R227-413. |
| Level 3 | Standards rated at this level are recognized as part of a fully functioning program. Most good Comprehensive Guidance Programs will have most standards rated at this level.   |
| Level 2 | Standards rated at this level indicate areas for improvement. An adequate explanation will have been provided clarifying why the program is functioning at this level in this standard. It will not be unusual for a school's guidance program to have some areas in need of improvement.  |
| Level 1 | Standards rated at this level are considered clearly deficient by the evaluation team and need immediate attention. Specific plans should be made for the time, effort and renewed commitment to the Comprehensive Guidance Program required for improvement.  |
| Level 0 | Standards rated at this level indicate guidance teams need further explanation and greater understanding regarding the requirements of the Comprehensive Guidance Program and/or the requirements of the on-site review process.   |

### **What this means:**

**Level 4 overall ratings** on a standard indicate a strong integration with school improvement and the Northwest Accreditation process, and a clear connection between Comprehensive Guidance Program processes and student results.

Mostly **level 3 overall ratings** for the standards indicate a strong Comprehensive Guidance Program. However, guidance team members should recognize that level 2 ratings help to identify areas for improvement.

Three or fewer **level 2 overall ratings** for the standards indicate that a Comprehensive Guidance Program can pass the review process; however, the review team should fully consider these ratings in the context of the overall program.

Four or five **level 2 overall ratings** would indicate that another review should be scheduled for the program in one year.

A **level 0 or 1 overall rating** for any standard would require, at a minimum, a six-month follow-up review of at least that standard by the same review team.

Overall ratings include careful consideration of all indicators for each standard. One level zero or level one on an indicator does not necessarily mean failure. Likewise, one level two on an indicator would not automatically eliminate a level three overall rating on a standard.

# Declaration of Eligibility for Level 4 Rating

1. The school is within 1 academic year of the Northwest Accreditation Site Visit

Date of scheduled visit \_\_\_\_\_

Today's Date \_\_\_\_\_

2. The school improvement team has been organized since \_\_\_\_\_  
and is fully functioning.

List members of school improvement team:

3. The school counselor(s) have actively participated with the school improvement team. Describe the nature of the counselor(s) involvement.